

CUSTOMER NO.24498
Serial No.: 09/830,235

PATENT
RCA 89,210

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 5-7, and 9-17 are pending.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention. Support for the amendment is provided in, for example, page 3, lines 27-29. No new matter is believed to be added by the present amendment.

Rejection of claims 1, 5-7 and 9-12 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Harari et al. (US 6893268).

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed below Harari fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of present claims 1 and 11, and as such, these claims, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Harari.

Amended claim 1 recites:

a card interface capable of distinguishing between a conventional integrated circuit card and said memory card, said card interface including a **connector having a first data port** for transferring data in accordance with a first standard and a **second data port** for transferring data in accordance with a second standard;

That is, the claim recites a card interface having a single connector arrangement that includes the first data port and the second data port for transferring the data in accordance with the first and second standards, respectively. Claim 11 has been amended to recite a similar limitation in method form. Applicants submit that Harari fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned limitation of claims 1 and 11.

Harari is directed to a system for forming a memory card using a mother card that is coupled to a daughter card. Separating the memory card into different portions allows the functional components of the memory card to be petitioned as desired (col. 3, lines 53-67). In this regard, the daughter card includes connector 24 that can be coupled to connector 14 disposed on the

CUSTOMER NO. 24498
Serial No.: 09/830,235

PATENT
RCA 89,210

mother card (Fig. 9-11). The mother card is coupled to the host via connectors 12 and 212. Alternatively, the host system may include two separate sets of connectors 212 and 14' so that either the mother card or the daughter card may be directly coupled to the host system (Fig. 11).

Clearly the interface connector arrangements disclosed in Harari fail to anticipate the card interface, including the connector, recited in the present claims. In the various embodiments shown by Harari, the **connectors are associated with a single type of a card** and does not include a first data port for transferring data in accordance with a first standard and a second data port for transferring data in accordance with a second standard. In the embodiment shown in Fig. 11, connector 212 is **uniquely associated with the mother card** and transfers data only as required for the mother card, while connector 14' is **uniquely associated with the daughter card** and transfers data only as required for the daughter card. Nowhere does Harari disclose or suggest that either connector 212 or 14' includes both first and second ports for transferring data from a particular card in a first standard or a second standard.

In view of the above, applicants submit that Harari fails to disclose or suggest a notable feature of the amended claims, and as such, claims 1 and 11, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Harari.

Rejection of claims 7 and 14-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harari et al. in view of Hayes et al. (US 6223348).

Hayes is cited as teaching the additional limitations recited in claims 7 and 14-17. However, applicants submit that even assuming arguendo that Hayes teaches the additional limitations, Hayes still fails to cure the defect of Harari as applied to claims 1 and 11 as discussed above, and thus, the combination of Harari and Hayes still fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of present claims 1 and 11. Therefore, applicants submit that claims 7 and 14-17, which depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, are patentably distinguishable over the suggested combination of Harari and Hayes.

CUSTOMER NO.24498
Serial No.: 09/830,235

PATENT
RCA 89,210

Rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harari et al. in view of Campinos et al. (US 6266415).

Campinos is cited as teaching a card that complies with the NRSS standard. Applicants submit that even arguendo that the teachings of Harari et al. is combined with the teachings of Campinos with respect to the NRSS standard, the suggested combination still fails to cure the defect of Harari as applied to amended claim 11. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 13, which depends from amended claim 11, is patentably distinguishable over the suggested combination of Harari and Campinos.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CUSTOMER NO.24498
Serial No.: 09/830,235

PATENT
RCA 89,210

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
Aaron Hal Dinwiddie et al.

By:



Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,677
(609) 734-6815

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

March 28, 2006